

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

ORSON S. MURRAY, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."

EPHRAIM MAXHAM, PRINTER.

VOLUME VIII.

BRANDON, THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1836.

NUMBER 33.

TERMS OF THE TELEGRAPH.

The Vermont Telegraph is published weekly at \$2 a year, payable within four months, or \$2.50 at the end of the year.

To subscribers out of the State, residing more than 100 miles from this office, the paper will be sent for \$1.75.

To companies, at whatever distance, who receive 12 or more copies in one bundle, and pay in advance, \$1.50 each.

Agents, who procure and pay for six subscribers, are entitled to the seventh copy gratis.

In making communications of new subscribers and remittances, the Agents will be particular in giving the names and residences of subscribers, and the amount to be credited to each.

All Baptist ministers, in good standing in the churches throughout the United States, are authorized to act as agents for this paper.

All communications must be paid for, except such as add to our list of subscribers one or more names.

Papers will not be discontinued until all arrears are paid, except at the discretion of the publisher.

For the Telegraph.

ATONEMENT.

Concluded.

In what does the atonement consist?

It is sharply maintained by our author, as though it were a capital argument in favor of his doctrine, that the atonement consists in the blood of Christ, when used in a particular manner. I am not backward to admit, that the blood of Christ is frequently represented as atoning for sin; but not, when separated, from the sufferings of Christ. Our author makes the following quotation, to prove that the atonement consists, not in the death of Christ, but in his blood:—Col. ii: 20, "Having made peace through the blood of the cross." As though nothing had to do, with the expiation of sin, but the blood of Christ. But if we read the next two following verses in the same chapter, the subject must be viewed in a very different light. Col. i: 21, 22, "And you, that were sometimes alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled, in the body of his flesh through death. Here we can prove as much by the death of Christ, as our author has proved by the blood of Christ. What then must be our inference, that there are two atonements; or that the same is meant by the blood of Christ, as is meant by his death? Scripture will not justify the separation of the death of Christ from his blood, in making atonement. They stand so intimately connected, not as cause and effect, but in point of time and circumstances, that the "blood of the cross" and the "death of Christ" are used interchangeably by inspired penmen. Isaiah liii: 5, "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him." 1 Peter ii: 24, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes we are healed." Col. ii: 14, "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." Heb. ix: 28, "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him, shall he appear the second time, without sin unto salvation." Rom. v: 9, 10, "Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved through him. For if, when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his son; much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life."

If the sufferings of Christ, had no part in making atonement, we are ready to ask, why was it necessary for him to endure the hidings of God's countenance and overwhelming agonies during the scene of crucifixion? If the blood of Christ, aside from death and its agonies, could have paid the debt, for the sin of the world, and opened a door of access to God, for Jew and Gentile, why was our Savior pressed down in the garden, till he sweat great drops of blood? And why did he hang three hours upon the cross, crying, "my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" It was then, as he hung upon the tree, that he was treading the wine press alone, bearing in his own body the sins of the world, making a show of the powers of darkness openly, and triumphing over them. As Christ reviewed the scenes of his incarceration, amid the awful convulsions of nature; while the heavens were veiled in blackness, the earth did quake, and the rocks rent; when the last deed was done, then Jesus cried with a loud voice, and said "IT IS FINISHED." And he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost. What was finished? Not the work of reconciliation. But the sacrificial atonement was finished, when Christ "gave up the ghost." The mere fact, that the Roman soldier, pierced the side of Christ, after his death, I believe, cannot be urged, with great force, in support of our author's sentiment. Christ, had sweat great drops of blood in the garden, during his incarnate life; but the act of the soldier, after Christ had left his human body—can not in my view, affect the question, either way.

After the resurrection and ascension of Christ, we next inquire concerning his office work, as he lives and reigns king, eternal, immortal, and invisible. Our author maintains that he is now at the right hand of God, to make atonement, as

our Great High Priest. This doctrine, is endeavored to be maintained from his favorite principle of the analogy between the type and its antitype. He maintains that "the high priest took the blood of the victim and went within the 2d veil and there alone in the holy place, he made atonement by sprinkling the blood on and before the mercy seat." Admitted. But what is the inference made by our author from this fact? He says, "this holy place first in the tabernacle and afterwards in the temple, typified heaven, where our Great High Priest is gone to alone for us." This opinion will readily follow the admission of his first general principle. But as that opinion, has already, in our view, been successfully controverted, we are not obligated to find "something in the antitype answering to every part of the type." But let us examine the true analogy between the type and the antitype, in the case now before us. It was the mercy-seat within the 2d veil, on which the blood of the victim was sprinkled, and upon which the Lord appeared in a cloud of incense, and accepted the offering of the Priest and dispensed pardon to the people. The Priest alone was permitted to enter within the 2d veil, and offer sacrifice. Now what is the true analogy between these rites and the work of mediation performed by Christ?

Let us inquire 1st, concerning the fact that the Priest alone was permitted to go within the 2d veil of the temple. Let the inspired Apostle answer. Heb. ix: 7—9, "But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people. The Holy Ghost thus signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest while as the first tabernacle was yet standing; which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices that could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience." "The way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest," or made public. Whatever this fact typifies, is of no great moment to us; whether it represents that, there shall be "one mediator" between God and man; or something else. The fact is all that the Apostle declares. He says the way into the holiest of all was not yet made public. Only the High Priest was permitted to enter; and he could do this only once in each year. Not even all of the holy tribe of the Israelites were permitted to sacrifice at the altar; much less any of another tribe; and least of all, could any from the Gentile nations. This however will be admitted, that the entrance of the high priest within the 2d veil represented the entrance of Christ into Heaven, according to the Apostle. Heb. ix: 11, 12, "But Christ being come a High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place having obtained eternal redemption for us." Here the Apostle says, that Christ "entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." This act of Christ, is represented by the entrance of the high priest within the second veil.

Let us notice 2d, the works of the high priest within the 2d veil, or in the holiest of all. Levitic. xvi: 15, "Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering that is for the people, and bring his blood within the veil, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat." What does this work of the high priest represent? Our author says, it typifies the work of Christ in heaven, as our Great High Priest, atoning for sin. Here we are again at issue. As this whole work is figurative, we remark, that we can not contemplate Christ, as answering to only one of these figures, at once. Now the mercy-seat in the holiest of all, is an acknowledged type of Christ. The word mercy-seat, means covering, or propitiation. Now Christ, in 1 John ii: 2, is said to be "the propitiation (i. e. atonement) for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." Now the word *ilamos* which we translate, by the word propitiation or atonement, means covering, the same as the Hebrew noun *copher*. Mercy-seat also was the covering of the ark. If Christ then has become the *ilamos* (i. e. the atonement) for the sins of the whole world; and if *ilamos* means covering, as we have already seen; then the mercy-seat, in the tabernacle, and afterwards in the temple, typifies Christ, as having made atonement for sin. As the visible glory of the Lord was manifested to the high priest between the cherubim upon the mercy-seat; and as the Lord then heard the prayers of the people by means of the priest, so now sinners can come to Jesus Christ, as their mercy-seat or atonement, make known their wants, and through Christ as their mercy-seat they can receive pardon of their sins, in answer to their sincere and believing prayers. I have already said that we can not contemplate Christ, as answering to more than one figure, at once.

I think, I have satisfactorily proved that the mercy-seat within the 2d veil typifies Christ, as having made atonement. Now the work of the priest, in sprinkling the blood of the victim upon and before

the mercy-seat must typify something else, besides the atonement; or else we have at the same time two types representing one and the same thing, viz: the atonement; and also we must contemplate Christ as answering to both these types, at one and the same time and in one and the same act.

Here is a confusion of figures, that is hardly admissible, in sound reasoning.—But I see no possible way of obviating this difficulty, according to the doctrine laid down in the essay. But setting the doctrine of our author aside, and maintaining the doctrine that has long been maintained, (and for aught I can see ought still to be maintained,) we arrive at a ready solution of this difficulty. By the sufferings and death of Christ, on earth, as our mediator, he became our propitiation, or mercy-seat. This characteristic in the divine Being, the mercy-seat in the temple typifies. After his resurrection, he ascends on high, and sits down at the right hand of God as our Great High Priest. Here then, Christ at the right hand of God, makes intercession by the merits of his atoning sacrifice offered on Calvary, for the sins of men. And all who come to God, through the medium of Jesus Christ—receive the sprinkling of the blood of Christ; as it is sprinkled upon the mercy-seat, that is, Christ; and we, by embracing Christ, as our atonement and Great High Priest, make his righteousness our own, and thus we receive reconciliation, forgiveness of sins, at the hands of God. "The slaying of the paschal lamb did not avail, unless its blood were sprinkled. The blood was shed in order that it might be sprinkled.—The sprinkling was necessary to preserve the Israelites. Neither will the blood of Jesus Christ prove of saving efficacy, unless it be applied. When wrath shall overwhelm the unbelieving, in the judgment of the last day, it will be of no avail to plead the merit of this great sacrifice, unless we have approached it for ourselves. Having boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, we must draw near with a heart sprinkled from an evil (or an accusing) conscience." "The merit of the Redeemer's blood is infinite, but its efficacy is confined to its application. In his own words, 'except ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, ye have no life in you.'—(Robert Hall.)

The sprinkling of the blood of the victim upon the mercy-seat, very fully represents the application of the Savior's blood, to the hearts of men, when they come to God, through the mediation of his Son.—But our author may say, "if this doctrine be admitted, what was atonement under the Jewish ritual, is not atonement when made by Christ. That is, the manner of making atonement is different in the two dispensations." I grant it. And to this conclusion we must inevitably come; and this conclusion solves the whole difficulty. In the ritual law, reconciliation, pardon of sins, and atonement were the same things. But in the new dispensation, we have shown that there is a difference. This result arises from the character of the two dispensations. One dispensation was ritual; the other is spiritual. When, therefore, a man had committed a sin, under the ritual, or Jewish dispensation, he offered a bullock, or a sheep, or some other animal, to atone for his sin. He laid his hand upon the head of the animal;—then slew it; then, when every thing was prepared, the officiating high priest took the blood, on the great atonement day, entered within the 2d veil, and there sprinkled it on and before the mercy-seat;—and atonement was made, or the sin was forgiven, in a ritual point of view, in all cases. But when we look through the ritual, to its spiritual meaning we shall find the same thing true, in relation to the ritual atonement, that is true of the atonement made by Jesus Christ. That is, an Israelite could make an offering for sin, and the priest could sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat;—and thus make atonement;—and still that Israelite, might go away, with no spiritual benefit, being as bad a man, at heart, as he was before. Unless he looked through the sign, by faith, to the thing signified, he was in no way benefited, except in a temporal point of view. So it is, with the atonement made by Jesus Christ. The whole world, receive more or less benefit, in a temporal point of view through the mediation and atonement of our Savior. But no man, receives spiritual benefit, unless he embraces the atonement, by faith, and has the blood of Christ applied to his soul. It is then only in one sense, that the pardon of sin "immediately and invariably" followed the atonement, even in the ritual law. And this sense, was the prevailing characteristic of that rite. But in the new dispensation, the order is reversed. And what was chief in the old dispensation, is the least in the new.

I can not conclude these extended remarks, without an expression of my motives in engaging in this work of reviewing. It has been no part of my design to encourage unprofitable debate on this subject; but to come at the truth. And it is my humble prayer, that whatever I have said, may have no other effect, than to create a spirit of humble inquiry into the great truths of the Bible; and lead souls to Jesus Christ, to accept the offers of salvation through the mediation of a once incarnate and risen Savior.

DALETH.

PRACTICALNESS OF OUR LORD'S TEACHING.

To give a single exemplification, let me advert to the axiom known by the names of the golden rule, and the universal law of equity; "all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also unto them; for this is the law and the prophets." The Savior himself ascribes to this rule the condensed and comprehensive character for which we have cited it; he pronounces it an abstract of all that had been prescribed by the law and the prophets; all they delivered on the subject is reducible to this, so that, were their writings lost, this summary might be expanded into all they uttered. Notwithstanding its conciseness, it is a maxim of so generic a kind, that, encircling the whole sphere of social virtue, it embraces all things whatsoever that sphere contains. No injury can be done, no reasonable kindness be omitted by man to man, which is not a violation of this royal law; nor can any duty be performed which it does not virtually enjoin. If it needed any other quality to recommend it, we might easily show that it has numerous excellencies fully answerable to its comprehensiveness. It is a rule as portable as our *self-love*, and identical with it; for what is but the love of self applied to the destruction of selfishness, by being pressed into the service of universal benevolence? It is the measuring rod, which is never out of the hand of self for its own purpose, legalized, and applied to mete out the same measure for the good of others. It seeks to equalize vicissitudes; to make a community of our joys and sorrows, by distributing them as nearly into equal parts as if we knew not the portion which would fall to us. It aims to transform self into an impartial judge, by giving it an interest in all the decisions which it pronounces on others. By compelling our selfishness to do the work of destruction on itself, it makes its content number as one, as a mere unit in the sum of the species; and to seek the welfare of the whole as the shortest and the only way of promoting our own individual interest. Let this inflexible law be understood and applied, and the trade of the casuist would be gone in the department of social life; for self-interest, prompt, and even intuitive when it sits in judgment for its own ends, would have only to imagine a momentary self-transmigration, and to transfer its judgments for the advantage of others.

We might extend this representation to another particular of a similar kind, showing the comprehensiveness of our Lord's maxims concerning the omission of duty.—The line which divides his kingdom from the empire of sin is so fine, that, like the line of geometry, it is length without breadth; it occupies no part of the territories which it defines; it creates no border land, no neutral ground. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad; a sentence which separates the world into two great classes; assigning over to the dominion of Satan the lukewarm with the hostile; and leaving them to discover themselves standing at least on neutral ground, they are actually and considerably within the frontiers of the kingdom of darkness.

How large a proportion of those, whom custom and courtesy agree to call Christians, live and die in self-complacency and hope, from the persuasion that they have been harmless, or, because they have done nothing. It seems never to occur to such, that to spend threescore years and ten, on a field of conflict, the listless spectators of a strife in which heaven every moment impetues them to take part, is disobedience and guilt. But, for this large sum of human ciphers, this aggregate of figures whose total is nothing, the final sentence is already prepared. Having never aspired to christian activity, or positive excellence, the doom which will consign the whole class to their own place will descend on them with this fearful formula, "Inasmuch as ye did it not." Now if human guilt is reducible to a graduated scale of demerit, by thus inscribing condemnation at the least and lowest degree on the scale, how unavoidable is the inference made that greater condemnation is reserved for every higher degree of sin; if the mere absence of activity, the negation of friendship, for Christ, be denounced, it follows of course that activity against him, that positive hostility, being superior guilt, has nothing to hope for. Thus, by recording a sentence against the omission of duty, the Divine Teacher has not merely destroyed the plea of harmlessness, and proscribed the whole tribe of the useless, he has tacitly comprehended and denounced the hostile and persecuting, leaving them to infer that to doom them formally would be superfluous.

It is, indeed, impossible to say whether, in the present state, the great motive of the gospel ever exists pure and uncompounded. Principles of action are too subtle for analysis; they elude our most anxious, but coarse attempts to reduce them to their elements. The motive, which, to our eye, looks pure as light, might, could we examine it through a moral prism, prove, to our astonishment, to be many-colored. The aim which we regard as in a straight line to the glory of God, might, could we obtain a comprehensive view of its course, appear, like a stream meandering to the ocean, touching at every accessible point, and taking every

object in the way, consistent with reaching its final destination. But indirect and compounded as is the best principle of human action, the Great Teacher would have us raise our eye to the highest point, and aim at the loftiest mark in the universe.—Unhinging us from the centre of self on which we have turned, he supplies us with a common centre in God. The eye which has glanced at the unclouded sun, is unable, for a time, to recognise the most familiar objects of earth; he unveils to us the splendors of the eternal throne—and the grandeur, and wealth, and most attractive objects of the world, fade and vanish from our view; he calls us away from the limited and sordid pursuits of time, takes us into the counsels of God, invites us to join hands with Providence, to mingle in the operations of almighty love in renewing, and beautifying, and making happy a world of immortal beings.

We must not omit to notice the advantage which the preaching of Jesus derived, from the simple and authoritative manner in which it was delivered, and the sanctions in which it was invested. In putting a man on any given course of action, it is important to his progress and perseverance, that he should feel unlimited confidence in the wisdom and authority of his patron. If the instructions he receives are couched in ambiguous terms, or delivered in a tone of uncertainty, or colored with the verbiage of special pleading, the methodical clauses and measured distinctions of the logician, the endless exceptions and provisos of the jurist or the misty film-work and cold abstractions of the metaphysician, he will most probably suspect that his instructor has yet to form a definite idea of his own wishes; or that he doubts their practicability; or feels that their questionable propriety requires the protecting veil of a disguising sophistry;—and the probability is, that, possessed with these very natural suspicions, he will never attempt to carry the instructions into practice; or will waste the feeling and passion necessary to action, in harassing alternations between right and wrong; or will construe the first obstacle he encounters, in the course proposed, into a providential intimation that he is not in the path of duty, and should instantly turn back.

The injunctions of Jesus were clear, determinate, and imperative; combining, at once, the simplicity of a father directing his child, and the authority of a king whose will is law. Taking his stand on the firm, broad, uncompromising principles of morality, he spoke, as conscience itself speaks, concisely, energetically, and to the point. The only logic he employed, was the logic of the heart; his only auditor, common sense. Loading every sentence with meaning, he leveled it direct at the breast. His style seems not merely to breathe a solicitude that it may be understood; it seems to burn with a resolution that it will be felt, that it will make itself to be remembered. This is true of the style of all his commands; but there are some of them which go even beyond this, they not only effect for themselves a lodgment in the memory, but when once there they defy oblivion, nothing can dislodge them.

The unauthorized precepts of other moralists are only guesses at right, and should therefore, be uttered with diffidence, and received with discretion. But he spoke, as the organ and oracle of God, for the universe and for eternity. He knew that his precepts are to constitute the laws of the last day; and that each of them is to sustain the everlasting awards of myriads of immortal beings. If any one could hear them enjoin, and yet refuse to them unbounded regard, his miracles came to his aid, collected and clustered around to abet and confirm them. He called in the terrors and powers of the world to come, to augment their sanction. If we consider his character and office, his relation to man and to the invisible world, we shall feel that, while propounding his laws, he occupied a position more imposing than that of the mount that burned;—that he legislated as in an amphitheatre filled with the attendant thrones and dominions of heaven, with the judgment seat in perspective, the rewards of glory piled up in sight, the penal fires of perdition flaring up at intervals and darting forth volcanic flashes from an unknown depth, and God meanwhile corroborating his authority in accents of thunder, and saying, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him."—Great Teacher

CHRISTIANITY & S. WAR.

It is, perhaps, the capital error of those who have attempted to instruct others in the duties of morality, that they have not been willing to enforce the rules of the Christian Scriptures in their full extent.—Almost every moralist pauses somewhere, short of the point which they prescribe; and this pause is made at a greater or less distance from the Christian Standard, in proportion to the admission, in a greater or less degree, of principles which have been superadded to the principles of the gospel. Few, however, supersede the laws of Christianity, without proposing some principle of "expediency," some doctrine of "natural law," some theory of "intrinsic decency and turpitude," which they lay down as the true standard of moral judgment. They who reject truth are not likely to escape error. Having mingled with Christianity principles

which it never taught, we are not likely to be consistent with Truth, or with ourselves; and, accordingly, he who seeks for direction from the professed teachers of morality, finds his mind bewildered in conflicting theories, and his judgment embarrassed by contradictory instructions. But "Wisdom is justified by all her children;" and she is justified, perhaps, by nothing more evidently than by the laws which she has imposed; for all who have proposed any standard of rectitude, other than that which Christianity has laid down, or who have admixed any foreign principles with the principles which she teaches, have hitherto proved that they have only been "sporting themselves with their own deceivings."

It is a remarkable fact, that the laws of the Mosaic Dispensation, which, confessedly, was an imperfect system, are laid down clearly and specifically in the form of an express code; whilst those of that purer religion which Jesus Christ introduced into the world, are only to be found, casually and incidentally scattered, as it were, through a volume—intermixed with other subjects—elicited by unconnected events—delivered at distant periods, and for distant purposes, in narratives, in discourses, in conversations, in letters. Into the final purpose of such an ordination, (for an ordination it must be supposed to be,) it is not our present business to inquire. One important truth, however, results from the fact as it exists:—That those who would form a general estimate of the moral obligations of Christianity, must derive it, not from Codes, but from Principles; not from a multiplicity of directions in what manner we are to act, but from instructions respecting the motives and dispositions by which all actions are to be regulated.

It appears, therefore, to follow, that in the inquiry whether war is sanctioned by Christianity, a specific declaration of its decision is not likely to be found. If, then, we be asked for a prohibition of war by Jesus Christ, in the express terms of a command, in the manner in which *Thou shalt not kill* is directed to murder, we willingly answer that no such prohibition exists—and it is not necessary to the argument. Even those who would require such a prohibition, are themselves satisfied respecting the obligation of many negative duties, on which there has been no specific decision in the New Testament.—They believe that suicide is not lawful. Yet Christianity never forbade it. It can be shown, indeed, by implication and inference, that suicide could not have been allowed, and with this they are satisfied.—Yet there is, probably, in the Christian Scriptures, not a twentieth part of as much indirect evidence against the lawfulness of suicide as there is against the lawfulness of war. To those who require such a command as *Thou shalt not engage in war*, it is therefore sufficient to reply, that they require that, which upon this and upon many other subjects, Christianity has not chosen to give.

We refer then, first, to the general nature of Christianity; because we think that if there were no other evidence against the lawfulness of war, we should possess, in that general nature, sufficient proof that it is virtually forbidden.

That the whole character and spirit of our religion are eminently and peculiarly peaceful, and that it is opposed, in all its principles to carnage and devastation, cannot be disputed.

Have peace one with another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.

Walk with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love.

Be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another; love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous, not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing.

Be at peace among yourselves. See that none render evil for evil to any man. God hath called us to peace.

Follow after love, patience, meekness.—Be gentle, showing all meekness unto all men.—Live in peace.

Lay aside all malice.—Put off anger, wrath, malice.—Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking be put away from you, with all malice.

Avenge not yourselves.—If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink.—Recompense to no man evil for evil.—Overcome evil with good.

Now we ask of any man who looks over these passages, what evidence do they convey respecting the lawfulness of war? Could any approval or allowance of it have been subjoined to these instructions, without obvious and most gross inconsistency? But if war is obviously and most grossly inconsistent with the general character of Christianity—if war could not have been permitted by its teachers, without any egregious violation of their own precepts, we think that the evidence of its unlawfulness, arising from this general character alone, is as clear, as absolute, and as exclusive, as could have been contained in any form of prohibition whatever.

To those solemn, discriminative, and public declarations of Jesus Christ, which are contained in the "sermon on the mount," a reference will necessarily be made upon this great question; and, perhaps, more is to be learnt from these declarations, of the moral duties of his religion, than from